1891
(L.R.)

F.G. No. 51 of 1891
Serial No. 67

Sub:— Refund Bill in favour of One Ramachandra Tagadar, Chamarajpet

G. R. S. 581

Previous references.

L.R. File No. 81

1891.
L. R.

Serial Nos. 1—7

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1—7

~~Part~~ B for Nov 1900

SUBJECT.

Refund bill in favour of one of the ryots of Nagadur, Chamarajanagar Taluk

---

Indexed

Razhunatha Char

W D 1351—GPB—20,000—13-12-15

Appeal No 27 of 91

Appellant

Ramachendriah
of
Thagadur
Hangunagood Taluk

Mr D Seenivasmurthy

1 Chikaveeraiah
2 Rangaiah
of Heggasattar
Chamarajanagar

Notice was served on Seshagiriya
Ramachandraya to answer
One by him [redacted]. The Sheikha
Mohammad in the entire case for
Appellant that in Fasli 86 i.e. 5-9
had been elected for Ramchandraya
the Ramgarwad and was entitled to
collect 12.4.2 chilli [illegible] for
Ayakatta
which his Shenai was entitled
under his being elected the
amount he says that he had given
the land to Seshagiri Row Thanjappa
of Kerahalli & that the amount
82.5 9
of Chance of Nagar then asked Manjya
Subba & attacked members of defendant
[illegible] he did not pay. She [illegible]
- he refuses to pay and that
he was not bound as not any increase
public from [illegible] Zagadam. The Thandya
Kerahalli from whom the defendant
said the Kaulgaon had to be collected
says that he never saw the defendant
has yet did not get possession [illegible]
by belonging to him. He also says that
the defendant lives in Kaulgaon and used
to receive the dikhati of the house in
[illegible] - that
the Amins could not any crop
be collected in land was attached
and [illegible] was received by the
Sale by auction of the same
The Respondent then proved the Amin
to say that he got the land 7 8 years ago and
a sale in execution was done and
did not pay the income to Vyapya
the plaintiff went in his name that
he was told some that the plaintiff
transferred his name this case pending
and that he got not yet [illegible] the

arrears. and also ask the Amr to
inform him if the patta was to
be transferred and that the arrears due
by him were and ago that he will pay
the Sheristadar & the Cuddapah Chamber
The Shekdar in his report says that
as the petn did not apply & have the
patta changed and to the patta was not
changed and that the landrevenue put up
to auction for arrears and taken by
Venkatramanappa of Mysore for Rs 8-
the then petnd & the by Amr saying that
he purchased the land of Chamberlain Thorsha
Singapa in the auction by orders of the Bd
Govt Asst and has been paying revenue
for 8. 6 years even this the land was lying
waste because the Chamberlain would not
let people cultivate the same; that
the he applied & the Tahsildar with the relt
certificate & have the patta changed; it was
not done; that as the reason of the
land lying waste was the revenue demand
in Chamberlain's name, the petn did
not pay revenue for last year; that there
he used notice & the Amr & he wrote them
that if the patta was changed & the name
he would pay up; that he has since
not been informed & the wrong and
consequence to the Amr petn by post
and received no replies thereto and that
he suspects some foul play; that he
therefore requests & have the petn heard
heard and receive the revenue from him
his petn was forwarded & the Amr for
disposal who called for the present
of the petn. The petn presented him
self & deposed & the following effect: &
"the lands owned by Chamberlain the Magistrial in
the lands were put up & auction in 1870
Kanchalli were put up & auction in 1870
Patta & a decree of the mysore Moffussil Court
I purchased the lands about 7 / 8 years ago in
the auction 2 or 3 years the lands were in my
possession and I have been paying Kandaya
thereto. 4 years back I applied with the copy
of the certificate & have patta in my name
& don't know what has become of the applin
I sent in a reminder even when did not
draw any reply. Seshagiriah says that he will
not let the land into my possession as the patta
is in his name and is enjoying the lands.

3 years ago I made a notice for arrears of revenue. I was in my tent when the patta is sent in my name and the above decision is in unlawful possession thereof, that may apply to have the patta changed was not applied to, and that I could pay the kandgam if the patta was changed, if not the same was then demanded; the above decision Sho is enjoying the unlawful possession of the lands - To the notice sent next year I made the same remarks. I had possession of lands for 5 years. In the 6th year I got people to cultivate the land Ramchandra threatened them people not to take on his account the lands were not cultivated the land was kept as such. The patadar says that his son in law got the land in the auction sale and that he was consequently in possession thereof. I sent a petn to the Rangapur Salah abt this matter I received no reply thereto The distance between Tegadoor and Hire Kodathur is 7 miles when the Subedar had come to Kodathur I was sent for by a peon 5-6 times. I was found on the occasion [illegible] I went for the matter once. The Amil had gone to Hagur I went back. It is my fault that I did not present myself before that I shall present myself with 6 days with all documents in my possession. If I file my petn might be cancelled. I have no document evidencing me having petnd together with the sale certificate and above as having sent a reminder"

Channa Jinnapa came & was asked by asstpm to ascertain if the Depullies had any work pressing. On reply the Subedar reports with marginal from people say that he has no lands in the village and that he is living in his uncle's house - On enquiry being made if there was any report as to the petn having petnd & the answer for change of patta with copy of certificate, the Revenue Inspector says that there is no such petn in the office. The sale of the land for the arrears fell due was confirmed by the asstpm on the 4th August 1883 and the petn was rec'd [illegible] Chief given on [illegible] the

5

his petition was refused as he failed to
appear in person in pursuance of notice
& amend & settle his dispute—
The Sheldon in pursuance of order of Mr Upton
to ascertain if the Chambley had no means
respect, depose on oath that the Chambley
has no property—that he lives in his children's
house and that The Bonavoud Chambley
was one grandfather from whom the
Schapinick was married—He and
reported the above to the Assistant under
& omission of the balance of 53-4-0 not
received. The assessor did ascertain
those facts on it to the amount of
one & 3 years which caused the necessity of
the omission of £53-4-0. He and reports
that the arrears fell due for further
& which notice was issued after march
that year. But time was consequently
before Chamberlayne & rangejoyed the proper
15 months. Here was also notice issued
& amount of voyage and about this time
was consequent between the above
Dks & about 8 months and in which
withdrew the money was unable of the
Defaulter was found available & meeting
the arrears In consequence thereof
My attached & old. A perusal of the
records will clearly prove that there was
culpability in this Tk liable & blame & this
delay. If the defaulter was in this Dk
steps might have been taken for the earlier
recovery of arrears but he lived in the
Rangejoyed Dk and the Sheldon Tk was active
steps and always gave evasive replies
which were forwarded to this Dk by the last
& rangejoyed. So it is not the former years
Dk in particular The assessor called
upon & also after the arrears Sheldon as he
was complained. upon by the Chamberlayne
that the Sheldon brings in explanation that
he was not to blame and that this post title
appear clear for the reports made by him
as contained in this correspondence
The assessor therein
asked the Chamberlayne and Sheldon
Rich & also of the grounds in charge the Dk
in the village was, why the paltry receipts
charged as per schedule rejected and
why nothing was done & recover arrears
speedily by complying with the requisition

under such circs the Ramada
will become liable to pay the arrears
how might they be called on to pay
cannot plead ignorance of law
chandrappa was
as it was patta
his having the
Mr and above
that the arrears
in addition
Oxford Sessions
the Deputy's proc.
dismissal for such
it could appeal the
Superintendent's
matter - Now the
is collected from the
no such thing appe
one - The papers
taken before the pros
make the following rem
"As I cannot agree with
how that the amou
recovered or whether
dispose the matter fr the
with any opinion there
2 The case is simply a
the road is the survivor
of Kenchalli village betw
In the ye
Rayadrug village Ramja
civil Court all ju
ors, did he purcha
sale - Dy
himself stated that at the
was no assessment on
of the land. After after
Ramachandrappa held the
Kandikal - the Aboriginal pa-
rupee was 6 & 11 may 85. Mr
-land for 3 years viz upto 83.
Ramachandrappa the pattadar
85-86 he paid one half of the
& became a defaulter on
July 88 Ramachandrappa
and the arrears viz 61-4

Ramachandrappa
Kandikal
Ramachandrappa
Ramachandrappa
Ramachandrappa

7

the land was held responsible for the arrears of rent
purchased by Venkata Ramanappa of
Sh & he is now enjoying & paying assessment
3 While the occupancy of the land was thus
transferred from one party to the other the patta
still remained in the name of the original holder
Seshagiriah. Attempts were made in the Adalat
to obtain the possession of Ramachandrudu of
have the patta transferred in his name
but he avoided appearing before the Court
under various circumstances when the Amin visited the
spot suggested that arrears should be recovered
from Ramachandrudu for Ramappa has
insisted that it be shown received Seshagiriah
as the patta still stands in his name
4 Seshagiriah presented me a petition
the Sarishtadar stating that he was not
responsible for the arrears and I consider
that he is perfectly right. Mere that the patta
still stands in his name is no fault of his
he did not sell the land privately to any body
It was sold under the decree of a civil
Court There was no necessity for him to give
a Nazeranah & obtain the Patta
subsequent purchasers & get the patta
transferred. Even since the Civil Sale, Seshagiri
himself has not cultivated the land; he
has been authoritatively deprived possession
of the land While to, I cannot see why he
& 5 is made responsible for the arrears.
now due on the land. I shall certainly
proceed against Ramachandrudu the Sarishtadar
who is a well-to-do man; of course
if the arrears cannot be recovered from
him I shall not be the party to write off
the sum but I am prepared rather than
that to let down premises rather than
come upon Seshagiriah for it

(Sd) Mahadevaiah

En reply thereto the merits of the
passed draft orders in respect of the above
Ramachandrudu can be pursued
Unless Ramachandrudu can be proved to
have cultivated the land in question any
posting it in the years & 5 the arrears have
due then D.S does not see how he can be held
liable for the arrears. His name does not
appear as holder of the land in any Govt
record.
Seshagiriah now of course, shd not be
made liable under the unusual circumstances

8

unpresented attempts to the contrary.
Among the many
of Kama[illegible] [illegible] cultivate
the land for the year[illegible] the account
is the largest ever to be entered
in the municipal list.

(5) Mr. [illegible]

It was accordingly done and
when the municipal [illegible] was submitted
- upon all the items except 79-11-11
Dr. [illegible] was [illegible] and the
Chairman ordered that a communication
should be addressed to Mr. Miller asking
Landlord [illegible] the [illegible] whether
[illegible] and [illegible] a date [illegible] for the
made fixing a date for the
sale of the attached immovables
of the defaulter [illegible] in which
he [illegible] himself [illegible] upon the
[illegible] Ramaiyar said that
- he wished they must be
[illegible] and [illegible] the bid be
(1978-1-7) [illegible] pay the amount as
deposit under protest and
his case was pending
disposal by the [illegible] in which
he had appealed

Submitted

7

M No 27 of 1891

A.P.M

Ramachandrudu
of Jagadur.
Narayanadrug
Represented by
L. Srinivasa Iyengar
advocate

Certain lands standing in the name of one Seshagiriya ~~Mudaliar~~ Mudali were sold for arrears of Revenue on 25th July 1888 & were purchased by one Venkataramappa appt who had purchased the lands in a civil ~~dis~~ Court auction in 1880 States that he did not pay the arrears because the Patta was not issued in his name as requested by him & that the sale was irregular — ~~The Collector in this State that appt never claimed title in his name before the lands were sold in 1888~~

& requests that the sale may be cancelled or the money Asst Rs 98-1-7 received from him on account of the said lands in

On 12 July 1891 appt pays Rs 98-1-7 on account of the arrears & the sale is cancelled

21 July 1891 Petition dismissed

December 1890 he
expended Rs Nine

He Accounts show
that only 13 months
after the land was
sold, a notice was
issued to the appellant ~~under Provisions of Act~~
that if he did not pay
the arrear due on the
land, ~~and only his~~ for 1885-86 to 1888-89
personal property would
be attached & sold but that he would not be in danger of
~~lose~~ losing his appointment
of Adhikary in another
Village — on this
notice, Appl. paid
Rs. 98-1-7 on 12th July
1891.

His collection
of the arrear from H.
Appl — who was not
a registered holder
of the land, after the land
was sold for
arrears was irregular
& therefore void —

Amount due the Bank
collected from him
in the respondents
name. The sale of the land
which was regularly carried
he cancelled

2/16/92

RMS

Mr Peppers name
Can not be found
directed to refund
the cost collected from
him after the land
was sold

the land to his Vendees.
hey enjoyed it for a period
Seven years, paying its
evenue to Government,
uring which time, the pottah
the land was, and is still
the name of the said
shaqueah, the original
oprietor.

The said Chicka Veeriah
d Rengiah subsequently
eed the petitioner to get
pottah of the land made
in their names. The petitioner
efore presented a petition
the Amildar of Chama
rajnagar, for the transfer
Pottah to the names of his
ndees. Thereupon the petitioner
beserved with a notice to
heave in person, and when
e appeared, he was examined
d in his statement he
uyed for the transfer of
tah.

The petitioner was then
osed that his petition
been rejected, as he
d to appear, though he
required to do so by
ns of 2 notices.
he Amildar of Chama
agar subsequently
uded of the petitioner

(General Serial No. 32.)

189 /

No. 2758 & 240
1890-91 1891-92

Name of Petitioner. Yaragambhatt Ramachendriah.

Village. Thagadoor

Taluk. Nunjangood.

District. Mysore.

Date of Arzi. 11-2-91 & 4-5-91

Date of Receipt. 14-2-91.

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. 4.

ABSTRACT.

The petitioner states that the year 1880, he purchased land called "Adoo" belongi to Seshagiriah, the Shanbo of Kerehally, Chamarajna Taluk, for a sum of Rs: 8 in a Court sale held und the orders of the ~~General~~ Judicial Asst. Commr., Mysore District, obtained possession thereof

2. Four or five months aft the petitioner sold the sa to one Thammadi Chik Veeriah and Rungiah Heggadeve Village of Taluk, for a sum of and delivered pos

his appeal is against an order passed by the Asst. on August 1888 or exactly 3 years ago.

The only explanation he gives for the delay is that his appeal ~~against~~ lying against the date fixed by the Asst. viz 12th Feby/91 for the sale of his property is within time.

Petition sufficiently stamped submitted to the Council

12th Augt/91.

A1

Call for Rec
ds
15/9/91

Section C.R.
File No 810 of 1891
Serial No

Issue a day for by-guardian to Pattadar Seshagiriah
II Pati
III Peter Venden Chik Veeriah Rungiah
The qn. is who were the real occupants of the land in the years for which amount

a sum of Rs: 98-1-7, being the assessment plus the Notice fees on the land in question. The petitioner explained that he had lost all interest in the land, in as much as he sold it to a second party, and referred the Amildar to the said Cheeka Veeriah and Ringiah, who in their deposition, evaded their liability to pay, since the pullah was not in their names. Thus the matter was referred to the Jamabundy Officer for settlement.

6. The said Shanbaque Seshagiriah, the original proprietor, in collusion with the petitioner's Vendees got the land sold for arrears of revenue and one Venkatanarayanappah bought it for Rs: 6/- for the said Seshagiriah. The petitioner's property was attached and ordered to be sold for the balance of Candayam due on the land.

7. In these circumstances of the Case, the petitioner appeals to Government

on

on the ground that he having sold the land long ago to a second party, and ceased to ~~have~~ have all any interest in the same, is not responsible for the amount due on it, and prays that the said Chicka Veeriah & Runjiah should be made liable, as also the land itself

After presenting the plaint, the petitioner was asked to show Cause for entertaining his appeal, after a lapse of 2½ years, from the date of endorsement viz 16th August 1888. This endorsement is to the effect that the petitioner's application to the Taluk, has been rejected for default of petitioner's appearance in Court. The petitioner now explains that ~~he presents an~~ his appeal is ~~from the order of~~ against the Amil's ordering the sale of ~~directing~~ his property ~~to be sold~~ on 12th February 1891, and that he is therefore in time. The Copy of this order is not produced. H.V 6/8/91 2 Rs. Stamps.

OFFICE OF THE
14 FEB 91

No. 2758

Dated 16/2/91

Applied for on 16/2/91

Dated 4

1888

ಕಾಲಿಕ ಪರೀಕ್ಷೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಉತ್ತೀರ್ಣರಾಗಿ ಮುಂದಿನ ತರಗತಿಗೆ ಪ್ರವೇಶ ಪಡೆಯಲು ಅರ್ಹರಾಗಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ಪ್ರಾಥಮಿಕ ಶಾಲೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕಲಿಯುವ ಮಕ್ಕಳಿಗೆ ಸಮಾನ ಅವಕಾಶಗಳನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಿಕೊಡಲು ಸರ್ಕಾರವು ಹಲವಾರು ಯೋಜನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೊಳಿಸಿದೆ. ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಮುಖವಾದವು ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡಂತಿವೆ.

ಶಾಲಾ ಪೂರ್ವ ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ ಯೋಜನೆ

ಪ್ರಾಥಮಿಕ ಶಾಲೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕಲಿಯುವ ಮಕ್ಕಳಿಗೆ ಸಮಾನ ಅವಕಾಶಗಳನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಿಕೊಡಲು ಸರ್ಕಾರವು ಹಲವಾರು ಯೋಜನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೊಳಿಸಿದೆ. ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಮುಖವಾದವು ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡಂತಿವೆ.

ಶಾಲಾ ಪೂರ್ವ ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ ಯೋಜನೆ

ಪ್ರಾಥಮಿಕ ಶಾಲೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕಲಿಯುವ ಮಕ್ಕಳಿಗೆ ಸಮಾನ ಅವಕಾಶಗಳನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಿಕೊಡಲು ಸರ್ಕಾರವು ಹಲವಾರು ಯೋಜನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೊಳಿಸಿದೆ. ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಮುಖವಾದವು ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡಂತಿವೆ.

ಶಾಲಾ ಪೂರ್ವ ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ ಯೋಜನೆ

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಸಿಆಸುಇ ೨೦೨೧ ಸಿಆಸುಇ ೨೦೨೧

No.
240
Regd

Appln. for 27 Sept.

Application for Extension of time for filing Written Statement

1 That the Defendant has been served with the Plaint and Summons in the above suit and the Defendant has to file his Written Statement on or before 27th September 1988.

2 That the Defendant has not been able to file his Written Statement within the time allowed by this Hon'ble Court as the Defendant has to collect the relevant documents and information from the Plaintiff and the Defendant has to consult his Counsel in this regard.

3 That the Defendant has been trying to collect the relevant documents and information from the Plaintiff and the Defendant has also been trying to consult his Counsel in this regard but the Defendant has not been able to do so.

4 That the Defendant requires 30 days time from this Hon'ble Court to file his Written Statement.

It is therefore prayed that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to grant 30 days time to the Defendant to file his Written Statement.

Defendant

Through

Advocate

7

8

9

10

11

12

ಕಲಬುರಗಿ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಸೇಡಂ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನ ಮಳಖೇಡ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂಬರ್ 1 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಟ್ಟು 1000 ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನು ಇದ್ದು, ಈ ಜಮೀನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಮಾರು 200 ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕಲ್ಲಿನ ಗಣಿಗಾರಿಕೆ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಈ ಗಣಿಗಾರಿಕೆಯಿಂದ ಹೊರಹೊಮ್ಮುವ ಧೂಳು ಮತ್ತು ಸ್ಫೋಟಕಗಳ ಶಬ್ದದಿಂದ ಸುತ್ತಮುತ್ತಲಿನ ಗ್ರಾಮಸ್ಥರಿಗೆ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಗಣಿಗಾರಿಕೆಯಿಂದ ಹೊರಹೊಮ್ಮುವ ಧೂಳಿನಿಂದ ಸುತ್ತಮುತ್ತಲಿನ ಗ್ರಾಮಸ್ಥರಿಗೆ ಉಸಿರಾಟದ ತೊಂದರೆ, ಚರ್ಮರೋಗ ಮತ್ತು ಕಣ್ಣಿನ ತೊಂದರೆಗಳು ಉಂಟಾಗುತ್ತಿವೆ. ಸ್ಫೋಟಕಗಳ ಶಬ್ದದಿಂದ ಮಕ್ಕಳು ಮತ್ತು ವೃದ್ಧ

No. 137 R

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 2758 & 246
dated 1st & 4th Feby 1891 & 4th May 191 received at the
Dewan's Office from Yarazambatty
Ramachendriah, residing
at Thagadoor village,
Tumkur Dist.

are
~~is~~ forwarded, together with ~~its~~ their 4
enclosures, to the Dy: Comm^r
for one Draft for submission
of proceedings and a precis
thereof

By Order,

BANGALORE,
15th Septr 189/.

For Chief Secretary

29 Drafted on
Councillor's order

Dy

W. A.C

(General Serial No. 30).

8600
12 Lis.
P. 62

1891

From The Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

To The Chief Secretary
to the Govt of Mysore

Dated 8" December 1891
Despatched 9"
Received

Enclosures No. 1 file of papers

General No. 750
No.

His official Memo No. 137, dated 20th September/91, forwarding for submission proceedings, petition from Yaraganbally Ramachandra residing in Thagudoor Village, Nanjangud taluk.

Has the honor to submit herewith the proceedings called for in the above, together with an English precis.

The petition received with the Memo under reply, is also herein enclosed

Deputy Commissioner
Mysore Distt

Serial No.

Petition dated 12/12/91

Submitted to the Council
15th Dec/91 AR

Appeal No 27
1891.

29th April 1892
AR 8/4/92

Adjourned to 6th June 1892 as per Order of Council
AR 30/3/92 AR 30/3

12-12-91

Compd ulty

Jamist of Vernacular papers in the case of Ramachendra
= diya yeragambatty Nanjangudu Taluk

No	Particulars	No of papers
1	Jamist Patty prepared in the Chama Raja Nagara Taluk cutchar.	
2	Notice to Ramachendraiya dy 12-5-86-	
3	yadi to Nunjangud Taluk from Chamaraja Nagar Taluk No 178 dy 12-5-86	
4	yadi to Chama Raja Nagar Taluk from Nanjangud Taluk No 278 dy 16-7-86	
5	Yadi to the incharge of the Treasury Officer from Chama Raja Nagar Amildar No 87 dy 27-7-86 and his reply to the Amildar No 69 dy 16-8-86	
6	Yadi to Nanjanagudu Taluk Cutchary from chamaraja Nagar Taluk No 160 dy 16-9-86	
7	Takit to Devenure Shaikdar No 158 dy 19-9-86	
8	and Shaikdar's report to Nanjangud Taluk No 207 dy 15-11-86	
9	yadi to Chamaraja Nagar Taluk from Nunjanagud Taluk. dy No 529 dy 17-11-86	3
10	yadi to Nunjangud Taluk No 697 dy 29-11-86	
11	Takit to Devenure Shaikdar No 194 dy 2-12-86	
12	and Shaikdar's reply No 441 dy 17-12-86	
13	Amildar's Takit to the Shaikdar No 826 dy 19-12-86	
14	Shaibgue's report dy 22-12-86	
15	Amildar's Takit to Shaikdar of Devenure No 217 dy 1-1-87	

Shaikdars report No 282 Dt 21-8-87
Yadi to Chamaraja Nagara Taluk from
Nunjangud Taluk No 679 Dt 23-1-87
Yadi to Nanjangude Taluk from
Chamaraja Nagar Taluk No 885 Dt 9-2-87
Devenure Shaikdars report to Taluk Amildar
of Nunjangud No 988 Dt 9-8-87
Yadi to ~~Nunjang~~ Chamaraja Nagar Taluk
No 445 Dt 10-8-87
Chamaraja Nagars Amildars Takit to the
Shaikadar of Kasaba Hobly No 609 Dt 12-2-87
Shaikdars report No 144 Dt 29-5-87
Nunjangud Amildars Takit to the Shaikdar
of Devenure Hobly No 26-Dt 31-5-87
Ramachendras Statement before Shaikdar
Dt 5-8-87
Yadi to Nunjangude Taluk from Chamaraja
Nagar Taluk No 586 Dt 19-8-87
Nunjangud Amildars Takit to the Shaikdar
of Devenure No 988 Dt 22-8-87 and his reply
No 149 Dt 3-9-87
Yadi to Nanjangud Taluk No 5336 Dt 6-9-87
Nanjangude Amildars Takit to Shaikdar
of Bayembally Hobly No 276 Dt 19-9-87
Shaikdars Ittilla No 530 Dt 31-10-87
Amildars Takit to Bayembally Shaikdar
No 4330 Dt 19-1-88
Shaikdars Ittilla No 711 Dt 10-2-88

8 Panchaits Mahajar of Lagadur Village dt 3-9-87

9 Yadi to Nunjanged Taluk from Chamaraja Nagar Taluk No 6288 26-10-86
Amildars Takit to Devenure Shaikdar No 134 dt 8-11-86 and his reply No 242 dt 17-12-86

10 Yadi to Nunjanged Taluk from Chamaraja Nagar Taluk No 716 dt 14-12-86
Amildars Takit to Devenure Shaikdar No 201 dt 17-12-86 and his reply No 101 dt 9-8-87
Reply to Chamaraja Nagar Taluk No 450 dt 10-8-87

11 Notice to Ramachendraik dt 4-2-87 ——
Yadi to Nanjanged Taluk from Chamaraja Nagar Taluk No 834 dt 5-2-87
Amildars Takit to Devenenure Shaikdar No 224 dt 9-2-87 and Shaikdars reply No 7 dt 13-4-87 —

12 Yadi to Chamaraja Nagar Taluk from Nunjanged Taluk No 1139 dt 16-4-87 ——
Amildars Takit to Ooyembally Shaikdar No 32 dt 30-4-87 and his reply No 34 dt 28-4-87
Yadi to Nunjanged Taluk No 2144 dt 28-4-87
Nanjanged
Amildars ~~report~~ Takit to Shaikdar of Hedethalay No 15 dt 3-5-87 and his report No 384 dt 18-5-87
Nanjanged Amildars Takit to Shaikdar of Devenure Hobly No 259 dt 21-5-87
Statement of Ramachendraik dt 5-8-87

Shirkdars report No 989 9-8-87
Yadi to Chamarajanagar Taluk No 448
9 10-8-87
Amildars Lakit to Ooyembally Shirkdar
No 230 9 16-8-87
Kare Bally Shanbogue Shushagiriah's
Statement 9 27-8-87
Ooyembally Shirkdars report to
Chamarajanagar Taluk No 398 9 28-8-87
Yadi to Nanjangud Taluk No 519 9 29-8-87
Nanjangud Taluk Amildars Lakit to
Devenure Shirkdar No 132 9 5-9-87
Shirkdars report No 174 9 30-9-87
Yadi to Chamarajanagar Taluk No 621
9 21-10-87
Amildars Lakit to Ooyembally Shirkdar
No 317 9 29-10-87 and Shirkdars report
No 537 9 6-11-87

13 A Jaffie patty with D/Commrs order
9 12-1-88
14 Sail Estikar 9 16-2-88
15 Do 9 Do
16 Do Do
17 Chamarajanagar Amildars Lakit to
Ooyembally Shirkdar No 477 9 16-2-88
and his reply No 748 9 25-2-88
18 Harag Patty 9 8-2-88
19 Petition of Ramachandra to Chama-
rajanagar Taluk 9 23-3-86
Amildars Lakit thereon to ooyem-
-bally Shirkdar No 776 9 27-3-88
Shirkdars reply No 3 9 10-4-88

20 Application of Ramachandraiah &
to Deputy Commissioner dy 26-4-88
An order thereon to the Amildar of
Chamarajanagar No 15 dy April 88

21 Notice to Ramachandraiah dy 23-4-88

22 Yadi to Nanjangud Taluk from
Chamarajanagar Taluk & No 1479
23-4-88 Amildar's Talkit & Revenue
Shirkdar No 4 dy 25-4-88 and Shirkdar's
report No 63 dy 25-4-88
Yadi to Chamarajanagar Taluk from
Nanjangud Taluk No 124 dy 21-5-88

23 Notice to Ramachandraiah dy 4-5-88

24 Deposition of Ramachandraiah, before
the Amildar of Chamarajnagar dy 14-5-88 2

25 Muchalka executed by Ryots of Kanchally
Chamarajanagar Taluk dy 10-8-88 ——— 1

26 Chamarajanagar Taluk Amildar's yadi
Talkit to Koyembally Shirkdar No 267
dy 3-8-88 and Shirkdar's Attila No 252
dy 14-8-88

27 Narain Rao's report of Chamarajanagar
Taluk to the Amildar 29-7-88

28 Said Conformation Statement with Am
Amildar's report dy 21-7-88 Deputy
Commissioner's Order thereon No 111 dy 29-7-88

29 Deposition of Shirkdar Soorappa of
Koyembally Hobly dy 21-8-88 before
Chamarajanagar Taluk Amildar

30 Chamarajanagar Amildar's Ittilla to the 2nd General Asste Commr No 140 dy 22-8-88 order thereon to the Amildar No 1786 dy 5-9-88 — 1

Amildar's Ittilla to Gl Asste Commr " No 1899 dy 19-9-88 order to the Amildar thereon No 2369 dy 7-10-88 — 2

31 Deposition of Devanur Shankar before Kunyanpet Taluk Amildar dy 1-12-88

32 Kunyanpete Amildar's Ittilla No 4579 dy 3-12-88

33 2nd General Asste Commr's order No 473 dy 20-3-89

34 Deposition of Chikaveeriah and Raghaiah before Chamarajnagar Taluk Amildar dy 29-4-89.

35 Chamarajanagar Taluk Amildar's report to 2nd General Asste Commr's No 96 dy 11-5-89 and order thereon to the Amildar No 95 dy 17-5-87 — 3

the Amildar's Ittilla No 123 dy ——

2nd Gl Asste Commissioner's Order No 166 dy 13-6-89 and Amildar Jail dy 12-3-90

36 English Memo prepared in the Police Asstt and Jamabandi Office Deputy Commissioner's Office and with Deputy Commissioner's order dy 24-4-90 — 2

37 Canarese yadi to Police Superintendant from Deputy Commissioner No 1630 dy 25-8-90 and order thereon to Chamarajnagar Amildar No 2769 dy 31-3-90 ——

(General Serial No. 30.)

189

From

The Chief Secretary
to the Dewan of Mysore.

To

The Deputy Commr
Mysore Dt

Dated 29th
Despatched } June/92
Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 5763 R
P No. 139

Directing that the arrears of land rev: collected from Ptr Rama-Chendrayya of Tagadur, Nanjungud Taluk, be refunded to him &c.

Cur Bs
81 of 1891
D4.

References to be marked.

Before the Government of *His Highness* the Maharaja of Mysore.

4

Appeal No. 27 of 1891

Appellant. Vs. Respondent.

Ramachandrah
of Nagadur
Ramanagaid Taluk
represented by Mr.
S. Srinivasa Ayengar, advocate.

Decision. 22-6-92

Certain lands standing in the name of one Seshagiriya in Kenchalli were sold for arrears of Revenue on 25th February 1888, and were purchased by one Venkatanarasappa. Appellant who had purchased the lands in a Civil Court auction in 1880 states that he did not pay the arrears because the Pulta was not issued in his name as requested by him and that the sale was irregular, and requests that either the sale may be cancelled or the assessment (Rs 98 1-7) recovered from him on account of this very land in December 1890 be refunded to him.

2 The Records shew that nearly 15 months

after the land was sold, a notice was issued to the appellant that if he did not pay the arrear due on the land for 1885-86 to 1888—89 not only his personal property would be attached and sold but that he would stand in the danger of losing his appointment of Shanboque in another village. On this notice, Appellant paid Rs 98-1-7 on 12th February 1891

3. This collection of the arrear from the appellant who was not a registered holder of the land, after the land was sold for arrears was irregular and therefore the Government direct that the sum collected from him be refunded to him. The sale of the land for the arrears due, which was legal cannot be cancelled.

By order

Chief Secretary

R 28/6/92

No 5763 Pet 139 dated 28/6/92 2-7-92

Copy to the Deputy Commissioner, Mymensingh with the revd papers received with his No 750 of 8th December 91.

By order

Chief Secretary

Draft

307

BCM

No. 27

Appellant
Ramachendrudu of Jagadur
Nanjangud Taluk,
represented by M. L. Sreenivasa
Iyengar, advocate Endorsement.

Section C

File No.

Serial No.

In reply to his Petition dated 11th February/91, Appellant is referred to the Deputy Commissioner who has been directed to refund the assessment collected from him after the land was sold.

2 The anc: are returned

~~is informed that~~

By Order,

Draft

Chief Secretary.

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,
PETITION DEPARTMENT,
29 June 1892.

2 — 6 —

Mysore Government Central Press Bangalore.—28-9-91—1000.

Issued with enclosures

BCR

1900 3023
~~189~~ R 1479

From The Dy Commissioner Mysore Dist

To The Secretary to the Government of Mysore Revenue Depart

Dated 25th

Despatched October 1900.

Received

General No. 407
No.

Enclosure No. One

Submitting for sanction a refund bill for Rs 98-1-7 in favor of one Ramachendrah of Jagadur, Channarayapatna Taluk.

Rev.
29/10/00

Refunds
Please submit proposal No. 5763/5.139 of 29/10/00
Rs 98/1/7. Issue refee put up

10/11/00

No: 401

Enclo:No: Once

Deputy Commissioner's Office,

Mysore District.

Dated 25th October 1900.

From,

The Deputy Commissioner,

Mysore District.

To,

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore,

General and Revenue Departments.

Sir,

I have the honor to submit for sanction a re-fund bill in favour of one Ramachandriah of Tagadur for ₹98-1-7 being the kandayam paid by him for Magi No:255 of Kerahally village of the Chamarajnagar Taluk for 4 years. The applicant bought this land at a Civil Court sale for ₹-80/ and after holding it for a year sold it to anther person who after paying kandayam for two years failed to pay for the 3rd year. The land on being sold for arrears of kandayam fetched a small sum, and so the applicant had to pay the deficiency with interest and notice fees. The petitioner paid the amount under protest and appealed to Government who in their Proceedings No:5763-P.139 dated 29-6-1892 have ordered the refund of the amount to him. Hence the bill. The long delay in the submission of this bill is due to some of the papers having been mislaid in this office.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient sevant,

For Deputy Commissioner,

Mysore District.

Compd:

Read:

Letter No. 401.

dated 25-th October 1900,

from the Deputy Comr.,

Mysore Distt., submit-

ting for sanction a

refund bill in favor

of one Ramabhandriah

of Tagadur for Rs: 98-1-7,

being the amount of

Kandayam irregularly Collected ~~paid by him~~

from him

for Maji No. 255 of

Kerahalli village,

Chamarajanagar

Taluk for 4 years

(from 1885-86 to 1888-89),

but subsequently ordered to be refunded

~~to be repayable~~ to him ~~as~~

~~by proceedings that it was~~

in

~~under~~ Govt. Order No.

Issued
24/11/00

5763 dated 28-6-92.
Pet 139
on the ground that
he was not a registered
holder of the land which
was transferred to others
by sale.

4207-8 & 26-11-00
7L 413

Order

Sanctioned.

26/11/00
For Offg: Secretary

To.

The Deputy Comr.,
Mysore Distt.
Comptr with bill